

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending and rejected claims 1-13. Claims 1 and 3-13 have been amended, claim 2 has been canceled, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1 and 3-13 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In the Action the Examiner objected to claim 2 and claim 2 has been cancelled.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 3, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and it is submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Davis. Page 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Davis and Omori.

Davis discusses a system that scans a physical image media, such as proof sheet for a printing press, to obtain a sample. The scanned image sample can be sent to a client over a network for display.

Omori discusses a system in which an image is divided into pixel areas for the purpose of rendering.

In contrast, the present invention, as discussed on application page 18+, designates a display area of an image to be displayed. This area designation can be by a user. Based on the designated area, the rounding of coordinates for the designated area and the difference in vertical and horizontal size/length ratios of the original image and the display of the device upon which the image is to be displayed, the system extracts a portion of the original image that is to be displayed and transmits it to the display device. As a result, the display of data on device is fast and appropriately visible on the display device.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are

patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 3 calls for the displayed image to be of visually recognizable elements. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/27/9

By: 

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501